

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23, 26 and 27. Claims 1, 11, 18, 21-23 and 26 are amended herein and new claim 28 is added. Claims 24 and 25 remain cancelled. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-23 and 26-28 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 7, 9-11 and 20-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,256,043 (Aho), U.S. Patent No. 5,848,396 (Gerace) and U.S. Patent No. 6,346,952 (Shtivelman) and U.S. Patent App. No. 2006/0122917 (Lokuge).

Starting on page 15 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Lokuge discloses the claimed salesperson selecting display section and the product catalog display section of the top page. However, Lokuge discusses a departmentalized web site (100) arranged according to each category of products such as, category A web page (104a) for displaying product information (106a) relating to that specific category (see, paragraphs 27, 28 and Figs. 1B and 2).

The Examiner points to paragraphs 33, 81 and Figs. 6 and 7 of Lokuge as teaching the claimed salesperson selecting display section of the top page. However, the sale support discussed in Lokuge is directed to traffic patterns of the users on selected parts of the web sites using a user's proxy (415 in Fig. 4) location within the virtual floor space to track information regarding the user's behavior while viewing the web page (see, paragraphs 57, 63 and 67). As such, Lokuge does not teach or suggest the "salesperson selecting display section" (see discussion of claims below).

On the other hand, Aho is directed to setting a chat channel between a viewer of a video scene and the closest person in the scene based on previously stored parameters associated with the viewer (see, col. 2, lines 42-55 and col. 5, lines 18-40).

Shtivelman only provides keywords from a chat session as a summary of a previous chat session (see, col. 20, lines 31-45), and Gerace simply presents targeted information based on analysis of previously recorded history of users' viewed information (see, col. 2, lines 43-55).

The claimed invention provides a top page displaying a salesperson selecting section together with a product selection section page. For example, as shown in Figs. 4-6, the top page of an imaginary store has an option for browsing products from a product catalog and

subsequently engaging in a chat with a salesperson in charge, and an option for selecting a particular salesperson and subsequently engaging in a chat with that salesperson.

Independent claim 1 recites, "displaying a top page of the virtual store having a salesperson selecting section together with a product catalog selecting section in response to the request." Claim 1 further recites, "a product catalog page having a plurality of products in response to the client specifying the product catalog selecting section of said top page" and "a responsible salesperson page having a plurality of responsible salespersons in response to the client specifying the salesperson selecting section of said top page." As such, the client has the option of choosing a chat between "a salesperson responsible for a product" and a chat between "a salesperson and the client in response to the client specifying the salesperson among said plurality of responsible salespersons from said responsible salesperson page."

The claimed method of claim 1 also includes, "selecting an attribute of a corresponding product based on a key word extracted at a real time from character information during a chat currently underway" and "emphasizing the attribute and adjusting display of the image." Claims 11, 18 and 26 recite similar features.

Claim 21 recites, "displaying a product selected by a user over a network responsive to a selection of a product catalog page displayed together with a salesperson selection page", "analyzing the chat for a key word associated with the product during the chat" and "emphasizing a product attribute of the selected key word in the displayed product and adjusting the display of the product in real time in response to the selected key word in the chat." Claim 21 further recites that the user is enabled to select "a salesperson among plurality of salespersons for the chat without selecting the product."

Similarly, claims 22 recites, "a first option providing a product catalog page displayed together with a second option providing a salesperson selection page", where the user is enabled to "select a salesperson among plurality of salespersons for the chat without selecting the product."

Claim 23 also recites, "displaying a product selected by a user over a network in response to selection of a product page displayed together with a salesperson page", where "where the user is enabled to instantly connect with a salesperson among salespersons made available via said salesperson page or view said attribute of said product by selecting said product page."

The cited references do not teach or suggest the above-identified features of the independent claims.

Lastly, on page 17 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint of suggestion of a particular reference. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's statement because supporting evidence related to what has been concluded as common knowledge has not been provided, and request that the Examiner produce authority for the statement.

Applicants also respectfully point out that only that which is capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration may be characterized as being well-known (see, M.P.E.P. § 2144.03(A) (the notice of facts beyond the record which may be taken by the Examiner must be "capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute").

Further, even if the Examiner's assertion and rejection based on common knowledge is valid, the claimed invention is distinguishable as discussed above.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 27 recites, "said keyword is extracted from content of the chat without requiring input of said specified salesperson and the user participating in the chat" and "information of the product presented to the user participating in the chat is modified to correspond with an attribute of the product retrieved based on the key word extracted during the chat."

The cited references do not teach or suggest the above-identified features including keyword "extracted from content of the chat without requiring input of said specified salesperson and the user participating in the chat" where the information of the product is "modified to correspond with an attribute of the product retrieved based on the key word extracted during the chat", as recited in claim 27.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIM:**

New claim 28 has been added to recite, "displaying a top page having a salesperson selecting section together with a product catalog selecting section in response to the request" including displaying "a responsible salesperson page" and "a chat display section" where a chat is set between a salesperson and the client "without requiring the client to specify a product for which the salesperson is responsible."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above discussed features of claim 28 including a top page displaying a salesperson selecting section "together with" a product catalog selecting section and setting a chat between a salesperson and the client "without requiring the client to specify a product for which the salesperson is responsible", as recited in claim 28.

It is submitted that new claim 28 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:**

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to the claims and new claim 28 because the amendments were made to clarify features recited in the claims and do not introduce significant changes that would require a further search.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By:

  
Tennit Afework  
Registration No. 58,202

Date: 01/24/2007  
1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501